Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-03 Picourient 417 Filed 07/08/02 Page 1 of 6

- 1	·	_	
1 2	GORDON H. DEPAOLI Nevada State Bar 00195 DALE E. FERGUSON		
	Nevada State Bar 04986		
3	WOODBURN AND WEDGE 6100 Neil Road, Suite 500	PTI	
4	Post Office Box 2311	8 C	
5	Reno, Nevada 89511 Telephone: (775) 688-3000		
6		S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	
7	Attorneys for Defendant, WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT		
8			
9			
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
12			
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	In Equity No. C-125-ECR	
14	Plaintiff,	Subfile No. C-125-C	
	riainilli.		
15		WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION	
15 16	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR	
		DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST	
16 17	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR	
16 17 18	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor,	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER	
16 17 18 19	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v.	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER	
16 17 18 19 20	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER	
16 17 18 19 20 21	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, et al.,	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER	
16 17 18 19 20 21	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, et al.,	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, et al., Defendants. MINERAL COUNTY, Proposed Plaintiff-	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER	
16 17 18 19 20 21	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, et al., Defendants. MINERAL COUNTY,	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, et al., Defendants. MINERAL COUNTY, Proposed Plaintiff-	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, et al., Defendants. MINERAL COUNTY, Proposed Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, et al., Defendants. MINERAL COUNTY, Proposed Plaintiff- Intervenor, v.	DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER	

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 417 Filed 07/08/02 Page 2 of 6

I. INTRODUCTION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

By Order dated May 3, 2002, the Court directed Mineral County to file a motion to effect service through publication by June 16, 2002. (See Docket #413). That order also required the parties to file responses to Mineral's County's motion for publication within thirty (30) days after the filing of that motion.

Mineral County served its Motion for Order of Publication (Fifth Request) on June 19, 2002. Therefore, the Walker River Irrigation District (the "District") will file its response to the Motion for Order of Publication (Fifth Request) on or before July 19, 2002.

Also on June 19, 2002, Mineral County filed a pleading styled Request to Late File and Request for Modified Service Order (the "Request"). The Request moves the Court to grant Mineral County three items of relief.

First, the Request moves the Court to accept Mineral County's filing of the Motion for Order of Publication (Fifth Request) two days later than required by the Court's order of May 3, 2002 (Docket No. 413). The District has no objection to this request.

Second, the Request moves the Court to make a determination that Mineral County's service of its Intervention Documents is complete. The District objects to this request as set forth below.

Third, the Request apparently moves the Court to allow Mineral County to serve its intervention documents on new parties identified as holding water rights without first obtaining leave of Court to add or substitute these new parties into the action. The District responds to this request as set forth below.

MINERAL COUNTY HAS NOT YET COMPLETED SERVICE OF ITS II. INTERVENTION DOCUMENTS ON NUMEROUS IDENTIFIED PARTIES.

In the Request, Mineral County requests that "the Court determine that Mineral County's service is complete." Request at 3, lns. 17-19. Mineral County, however, has not completed service of its intervention documents on numerous identified parties in this matter.

On June 18, 2002, the Court entered an order in this matter as Docket No. 414. That order stated that Mineral County has either failed to properly serve its Intervention

26

27 28

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 417 Filed 07/08/02 Page 3 of 6

Documents or the information contained in the record in this matter does not establish proper service with respect to approximately 84 parties. See Docket No. 414 at 5, 6. Mineral County has filed nothing since the Court's entry of the June 18, 2002, order to indicate that the status of service has changed with respect to these approximately 84 parties. Clearly, under these circumstances, Mineral County's service cannot be considered complete. The Court should deny Mineral County's request that service of its Intervention Documents be deemed complete.

III. THE COURT SHOULD DENY MINERAL COUNTY'S REQUEST TO SERVE PARTIES WITHOUT THEIR FIRST HAVING BEEN ADDED OR SUBSTITUTED INTO THIS ACTION OR, ALTERNATIELY, IF IT GRANTS THE REQUESTED RELIEF IT SHOULD REQUIRE MINERAL COUNTY TO FORMALLY ADD OR SUBSTITUTE THESE PARTIES AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AFTER SERVICE.

In the Request, Mineral County also asks the Court to allow it to serve parties, recently and in the future identified as holding water rights, without first obtaining leave of Court to add or substitute these parties into the action. To avoid confusion caused by service on defendants not identified in the caption, Mineral County also requests that the list of proposed defendants in the caption be abbreviated to "et al." See Request at 4, lns. 3-7.

Mineral County's proposal to serve parties prior to their having been added or substituted into the action violates both Rules 4 and 10 of the Rules of Federal Procedure. Rule 4(a) requires a summons, in this case the Notice In Lieu of Summons, to identify the parties. Rule 10(a) requires that "[i]n the complaint the title of the action shall include the names of all the parties." These requirements ensure that the defendant has sufficient notice that the plaintiff's claims are against him and that he must respond to those claims to avoid the entry of judgment by default. Therefore, the Court should not allow Mineral County to serve parties without first obtaining leave of court to substitute or add them, and it should not allow Mineral County to abbreviate the caption to read "et al." See Feliciano v. Dubois, 846
F.Supp. 1033 at 1048 (D.Mass. 1994) (plaintiffs may not use the term "et al." but must instead specifically identify in the caption of the complaint each defendant against whom relief is sought).

73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 417 Filed 07/08/02 Page 4 of 6

Finally, in the event that the Court does allow Mineral County to serve parties 1 without first substituting or adding them, it should require that Mineral County obtain an order 2 of the Court that adds or substitutes these parties as soon as possible after service occurs. If 3 the Court does not require Mineral County to obtain an order of this nature, parties will be 4 substituted or added into this action by Mineral County without the Court, District or any 5 other party having knowledge of the substitution or addition.1 6 Dated this day of July, 2002. 7 8 WOODBURN AND WEDGE 9 6100 Neil Road, Suite 500 10 Post Office Box 2311 Reno, Nevada 89511 11 12 By: 13 Nevada State Bar 00195 14 DALE E. FERGUSON Nevada State Bar 04986 15 16 Attorneys for WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT 17 18 19 20 21 C:\WP\WRID\0083\Response 070502.doc 22 23 24 25 26 27 Similarly, at the May 3, 2002 Status Conference, the Court ruled that Mineral County may not

unilaterally add parties to the Caption without leave of Court because it would result in total

28

chaos.

⁻⁴⁻

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 417 Filed 07/08/02 Page 5 of 6

- 1			
1	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING		
2	I certify that I am an employee of Woodburn and Wedge and that on this date, I		
3	deposited in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of the foregoing		
4	WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST TO LATE		
5	FILE AND REQUEST FOR MODIFIED SERVICE ORDER in an envelope addressed to		
6			
7	Shirley A. Smith	William W. Quinn Office of the Field Solicitor	
8	Assistant U.S. Attorney 100 West Liberty Street, #600	Department of the Interior	
9	Reno, NV 89509	401 West Washington Street, SPC 44 Phoenix, AZ 85003	
10	George Benesch	Western Nevada Agency	
11	P.O. Box 3498	Bureau of Indian Affairs	
12	Reno, NV 89505	1677 Hot Springs Road Carson City, NV 89706	
13	Kenneth Spooner	R. Michael Turnipseed, P.E.	
14	General Manager	Division of Water Resources	
15	Walker River Irrigation District P.O. Box 820	State of Nevada 123 West Nye Lane	
16	Yerington, NV 89447	Carson City, NV 89710	
17	Garry Stone	Alice E. Walker	
	United States District Court Water Master	Greene, Meyer & McElroy 1007 Pearl Street, Suite 220	
18	290 South Arlington Avenue Third Floor	Boulder, CO 80302	
19	Reno, NV 89501		
20	John Kramer	Matthew R. Campbell, Esq.	
21	Department of Water Resources 1416 Ninth Street	David Moser, Esq. McCutchen, Doyle, Brown & Enerson	
22	Sacramento, CA 95814	Three Embarcadero Center	
	<u> </u>	San Francisco, CA 94111	
23	 Michael W. Neville	Ross E. de Lipkau	
24	California Attorney General's Office	Marshall, Hill, Cassas & de Lipkau	
25	455 Golden Gate Avenue Suite 11000	P.O. Box 2790 Reno, NV 89505	

28 WOODBURN AND WEDGE 6100 Neil Road Reno, Nevada 89511 Tel: (775) 688-3000

26

27

San Francisco, CA 94102-3664

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 417 Filed 07/08/02 Page 6 of 6

		_
2	Susan Schneider Indian Resources Section U.S. Department of Justice	Marta Adams Deputy Attorney General State of Nevada
3	999 18 th Street Suite 945, North Tower Denver, CO 80202	100 North Carson street Carson City, NV 89701
4		
5	Mary Hackenbracht	Treva J. Hearne Zeh, Spoo, Quade & Hearne
6	Deputy Attorney General State of California	575 Forest Service
7	1515 Clay Street, 20 th Floor Oakland, CA 94612-1413	Reno, NV 89509
8	James Shaw	Hank Meshorer
9	Water Master U.S. Board of Water Commissioners	United States Department of Justice Natural Resources Division
10	P.O. Box 853	Ben Franklin Station
11	Yerington, NV 89447	P.O. Box 7397 Washington, D.C. 20044
12	Linda Bowman	Kelly Chase
13	540 Hammill Lane Reno, NV 89511	P.O. Box 2800 Minden, NV 89423
14	Keno, NV 89311	Mindon, 14 7 05 125
15	Dated this a th day of July, 2002.	
16		PENSLODE W. COLLER
17		Penelope H. Colter
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

WOODBURN AND WEDGE 6100 Neil Road Reno, Nevada 89511 Tel: (775) 688-3000